



WASHINGTON STATE
Workforce Training and
Education Coordinating Board

BOARD MEETING AGENDA

Yakima Valley Community College

1015 S. 16th Avenue

Deccio Building/Parker Room

Yakima, WA 98907

September 22, 2005

Approximate Time

Tab

8:30 a.m.	Welcome/Introductions Dr. Linda Kaminski, President, Yakima Valley Community College	
8:40 a.m.	Chair's Report David Harrison, Chair	<i>1</i>
8:55 a.m.	Executive Director's Report Ellen O'Brien Saunders, Executive Director	
9:10 a.m.	Supplemental Budget Requests <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workforce Board Pam Lund, Workforce Board• SBCTC and OSPI	<i>2</i>
10:00 a.m.	Break	
10:15 a.m.	Private Vocational Schools Act, Policy Revisions (Action) Peggy Rudolph, Workforce Board	<i>3</i>
11:00 a.m.	Workforce Development Councils' Plans for 2005-2007 (Action) Martin McCallum, Workforce Board Holly Watson, Employment Security Department	<i>4</i>
11:30 p.m.	Lunch and Campus Tour	
1:00 p.m.	Student Success in High School: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dropout Projects: 2004-2005 Evaluation Pam Lund, Workforce Board Evelyn Hawkins, Workforce Board• High School Reform Policy (Action) Wes Pruitt, Workforce Board	<i>5</i>
2:00 p.m.	High Skills, High Wages 2006: Development Process (Action) Madeleine Thompson, Workforce Board	<i>6</i>
2:30 p.m.	Adjourn	

Goals for the Workforce Training and Education System

- To close the gap between the needs of employers for skilled workers and the supply of Washington residents prepared to meet that need.
- To enable workers to make smooth transitions so that they, and their employers, may fully benefit from the new, changing economy, by putting in place a coherent strategy for dislocated and incumbent worker training.
- To assist disadvantaged youth, persons with disabilities, new labor market entrants, recent immigrants, and other low-wage workers in moving up the job ladder during their lifetimes by developing a wage progression strategy for low-income workers. Specific progress will be made in improving operating agencies and reducing the earnings gap facing people of color, adults with disabilities, and women.
- To make the vision of WorkSource a reality so that workforce development programs are customer friendly, broadly accessible, and fully committed to Continuous Quality Improvement.

Key Dates

<p>Workforce Strategies Conference October 24-26, 2005 <i>WestCoast Ridpath Hotel, Spokane</i></p> <p>November Board Meeting Wednesday, November 16, 2005 – Dinner Thursday, November 17, 2005 – Meeting <i>Vancouver</i></p> <p>January Board Meeting Thursday, January 26, 2006 <i>Olympia</i></p> <p>March Board Meeting Thursday, March 16, 2005 <i>Olympia</i></p> <p>May Board Meeting Thursday, May 11, 2006 <i>Olympia</i></p>	<p>June Board Meeting Wednesday, June 28, 2006 – Dinner Thursday, June 29, 2006 – Meeting <i>Tacoma</i></p> <p>August Board Retreat Thursday, August 3, 2006 – Retreat Friday, August 4, 2006 – Retreat <i>Leavenworth</i></p> <p>September Board Meeting Wednesday, September 20, 2006 – Dinner Thursday, September 21, 2006 – Meeting <i>Spokane</i></p> <p>November Board Meeting Wednesday, November 15, 2006 – Dinner Thursday, November 16, 2006 – Meeting <i>Seattle</i></p>
---	---

If you are a person with a disability and require an accommodation for attendance, please call the Workforce Board at (360) 753-5677 as soon as possible to allow us sufficient time to make arrangements.

Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board

Minutes
July 7, 2005

Meeting called to order at 8:40 a.m.

David Harrison, Chair
Mike Hudson for Don Brunell, Association of Washington Business (AWB)
John McGinnis, Labor
Beth Thew, Labor
Kyra Kester for Terry Bergeson, Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)
Asbury Lockett, Business
Tony Lee, Fremont Public Association
Karen Lee, Employment Security Department (ESD)
Earl Hale and Jim Crabbe, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
Ellen O'Brien Saunders, Executive Director

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. David Harrison welcomed guests and introductions were made.

Motion 05-104-01

Ms. Beth Thew moved that the minutes of May 12, 2005, be approved. Mr. Asbury Lockett seconded. The minutes passed as presented.

Chair's Report

Mr. Harrison updated the Board on the change to the retreat dates and location from July 27-28 to August 10 in Olympia. Mr. Harrison then updated the Board of continued work with the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) on its proposal for college admission requirements. Mr. Harrison announced he is chairing the WorkFirst Reexamination Workgroup for the Governor. He hopes that his role will help benefit WorkFirst / WorkSource integration. Mr. Tony Lee commented on the restrictive time available for WorkFirst clients to complete training, and the lack of childcare assistance while in school. Mr. Jim Crabbe noted that early comprehensive assessment is critical; Ms. Rin Causey added that the Workforce Development Councils need to be involved with the work.

Executive Director's Report

Ms. Ellen O'Brien Saunders discussed Skamania County's request to move to the Tri-County Workforce Development Area. She covered the process that must take place in order to make this type of change.

She alerted the Board to an application to participate in the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices' Young Adults with Disabilities Policy Academy. Ms. Patti Stoneman

Lowe thanked the Board and Mr. Martin McCallum especially for their work on this application. Ms. O'Brien Saunders updated the Board on our progress with the Department of Labor on our Workforce Investment Act (WIA) targets.

Finally, she announced that Governor Gregoire has formed a Steering Committee to improve Washington's education, Washington Learns. Ms. O'Brien Saunders asked for the Board's participation if they are called upon. She is still hopeful for the passage at the federal level of the reauthorization of the WIA, Perkins, and others.

Mr. Harrison informed the Board of Mr. Earl Hale's impending retirement. He asked about the process for recruitment, and thanked Mr. Hale for his commitment and efforts for the community college system.

Allocation of Federal Perkins Funds for 2005-2006

Mr. Walt Wong summarized information on the allocation of federal funds for the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Act. Mr. Wong added that he is optimistic for reauthorization.

Motion 05-104-02

Mr. Mike Hudson moved to accept the proposed allocation of the federal Perkins funds. Ms. Karen Lee seconded. The motion passed.

Mr. Hudson suggested that more in-depth discussion on Perkins is needed. Ms. O'Brien Saunders agreed that it would be a good topic for the retreat. Ms. Kyra Kester added that we need to focus on the education benefit and the philosophical purpose. Mr. Harrison noted that we would start the discussion for the retreat and finish it at another meeting. Mr. Crabbe added that we need to watch the federal developments before we put too much time into the topic.

Agency Operating Budget for 2005-2006

Mr. Wong presented the Agency Operating budget to the Board. He noted two changes to the annual budget. First, INTEC was not included in the Governor's Proposed Budget nor the legislative budget documents. Hence, the General Fund State was reduced accordingly. Second, phased salary increases for represented and non-represented employees are reflected in the annual budget. He walked the Board through the different fund sources and operating costs. He is confident that the work of the staff is very closely related to the strategic plan.

Motion 05-104-03

Mr. John McGinnis moved to approve the recommended motion. Mr. Lockett seconded. The motion passed as presented.

Private Vocational Schools Act Administration and Policy

The sudden closure of Business Career Training Institute (BCTI), which affected 489 students, created concerns among the Board regarding private vocational schools. Ms. Gena Wikstrom discussed these concerns. She informed the Board of the role that the Washington Federation of Private Career Schools and Colleges plays with the private career schools. She also updated the Board on the electronic licensing process and reported that the procedure takes less time now. Ms. Wikstrom noted that three oversight agencies (HECB, Department of Licensing, and the Workforce Board) regulate private vocational schools. She indicated willingness to review policies and regulations to ensure that students are protected.

Continuing the discussion of the Board's role with private career schools, Ms. Peggy Rudolph discussed the Tuition Recovery Trust Fund (TRTF). All schools licensed by the agency pay into the TRTF for 10 years; this helps cover students' lost tuition if a school closes. Federal loans can be forgiven if the student was in attendance when the school closed or if the student dropped out of school 90 days before the closure. Once a loan has been discharged, the student becomes eligible to apply again. Ms. Rudolph has reviewed other states' regulations; she noted that our state does not have specific standards for financial responsibility.

Mr. McGinnis inquired how students find out about the TRTF or other information regarding a closure. He wanted to know if a press release went out to notify the students. The Board addressed the early warning signs and the process during and after a closing. Ms. Wikstrom supports strengthening the schools' fiscal responsibility. Mr. Hale would like to see performance expectations incorporated into licensing requirements. Ms. Lee thinks we need to strengthen the student recovery process. Mr. Harrison noted that the Board needs to develop a master list of concerns for further discussion and review a proposal in September. Mr. Hudson noted that a rating system might be a good way to help the situation but we need to be careful of the impact on these businesses. Mr. Lee agreed with Mr. Hudson about heavy-handed regulations but also noted that schools do want to be protected from the "bad apples." Ms. Thew wanted to make sure this is not an automatic reaction; Oregon's requirements did not prevent the closing of the BCTI campuses there.

Washington State's Economy—Headlines

Mr. Richard Kaglic thanked Ms. Lee and Ms. O'Brien Saunders for the invitation to present to the Board. He summarized the current conditions of Washington's economy. Mr. Kaglic alerted the Board to strong growth of construction in Washington, due in part to strong home sales and low interest rates. Job growth in Washington is exceeding the national average. The unemployment rate has converged with the national average. Consumers remain confident to spend, and employers are hiring. Mr. Hale asked about structural changes and the decline of manufacturing. Mr. Kaglic responded that manufacturing is not declining, but manufacturing jobs are, since the industry has become more efficient and productive. Mr. Hudson complimented the Labor Market and Economic Analyst (LMEA) unit of Employment Security. Ms. Lee added that LMEA is nationally recognized and would like to see them as frequent visitors to the Board meetings.

Labor Market Information Plan for 2005-2006

Mr. Bryan Wilson spoke about the Labor Market Information Plan and then introduced Mr. Greg Weeks. Mr. Weeks summarized highlights of the plan. He shared a new data source that can compile information to be used for a number of research possibilities. Ms. Stoneman Lowe asked if the information is available in alternative formats.

Motion 05-104-04

Mr. Hudson moved to adopt the recommended motion. Mr. McGinnis seconded. The motion to endorse the One-Stop Labor Market Information Plan passed.

Work Readiness Credential: Pilot Project Update

Ms. Pam Lund announced that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Center for Workforce Preparation has become the home base for the Work Readiness Credential. She recognized Mr. Hudson and Ms. Heather Fredericks, for their contributions to the project thus far. A number of newspaper articles have been published highlighting the Work Readiness Credential (WRC) project. Ms. Lund introduced Ms. Sondra Stein. Ms. Stein summarized the history of WRC to the Board. The states are the funders and owners of the project but there are national partners involved. The WRC will affirm that an entry-level job seeker or employee has “soft” skills and understands how to apply those skills on-the-job. The next step after the pilot tests is field-testing and will include over 600 participants nationally.

Mr. Harrison inquired whether state entities would assist with setting up registered sites for credentialing. Mr. Crabbe asked about the remediation piece. Ms. Stein explained that there would be a minimum (i.e., “cut”) score required in each area and a total score to receive the credential. If a person fails a section or the total assessment, they could receive additional help and then will be allowed to retest. Mr. Hudson views the WRC as a way that smaller businesses can compete with larger companies. Ms. Stoneman Lowe encouraged the Board to include persons with special needs in the planning for implementation of WRC. Mr. McGinnis inquired about the funding of the WRC training and how this will roll out. Mr. Crabbe noted that the project needs to be staffed and resourced to be successful. States will need to have some local control in the setup.

State Plan for Adult Basic Education 2005-2010

Mr. Wilson provided an analysis of the Adult Basic Education (ABE) plan. He shared the changes staff felt the plan should include: a goal to increase the integration of literacy and vocational training, and a performance accountability indicator of the earnings of former program participants. He then introduced Ms. Kathy Cooper, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC). She walked the Board through the ABE plan. Ms. Cooper addressed the Workforce Board staff analysis. Mr. Harrison noted that SBCTC could be more explicit on goal two. Ms. Cooper acknowledged that the language is absent, will be added, and will be highlighted in other places in the plan.

Motion 05-104-05

Mr. McGinnis moved to adopt the modified ABE plan. Mr. Lockett seconded. The motion passed as modified.

Modified recommendation, following “alignment”, delete the remainder and add:

Whereas, These two additions having been made;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board approves the 2005-2010 State Plan for Adult Basic Education.

WorkSource Performance Indicators: Third Annual Report

Mr. Carl Wolfhagen presented results of the annual WorkSource Performance Evaluations. Several types of outcomes were measured: competencies, employment, earnings, and customer satisfaction. He stated that the use of WorkSource services increased, as did employer satisfaction with those services. Mr. Lockett questioned whether the indicators (for example, of seamlessness) might be too subjective. Ms. Lee questioned the use of the State WorkSource Performance Indicators, as opposed to the Employment Security Department’s (ESD’s) Management Measures. Mr. Wilson stated that a conversation with ESD should take place in the future to discuss these approaches. Mr. Harrison noted that further discussion could take place at the retreat.

Making High School Meaningful

Navigation 101 Model for Improving Student Planning

Ms. Kester introduced Mr. Tim Stensager and Mr. Dan Barrett. Mr. Stensager gave background information on the Franklin Pierce School District to the Board. Navigation 101 is a comprehensive guidance system developed by a team of teachers and counselors. He shared a video on Individualized Student Plans. Some of the important pieces to this program are: student led conferences, 12th grade culminating project, and parental engagement. Mr. Stensager showed the Board the emerging data. Ms. Kester added that this could be the solution to some of the issues underlying the HECB admission requirements. Mr. Harrison noted that the Governor loves this model and would like to see school districts take it on. Ms. Lee inquired if this could be another way to engage parents in school and a process for their success? Ms. Stein commented that this has a similar framework to Equipped for the Future and the two programs could work together.

Policy on Restructuring

Mr. Wes Pruitt presented to the Board possible policy positions on restructuring high schools. Some of the objectives are effective career guidance, development and assessment of career-related skills, and the improvement of student transitions to non-baccalaureate postsecondary education and training. Mr. Harrison asked if the Board should endorse Navigation 101 as a solution to the first objective. Ms. Kester noted that more general would be better. The

legislature has created a joint select committee to review the basic structure of middle and high schools. Mr. Harrison engaged the Board to think about their position on the restructuring of high schools. Ms. O'Brien Saunders stated that the Board has supported OSPI's budget request to expand it and advocates would like to see Navigation 101 in more high schools. She also noted that we have sent the Navigation 101 booklets to HECB; Ms. Kester added that we received no response from them since the last meeting. Mr. Harrison invited the Board to revisit this issue at the retreat and again in September.

The meeting adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

Ellen O'Brien Saunders, Secretary

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Ellen O'Brien Saunders". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
2006 MEETING SCHEDULE

*Thursday, January 26, 2006 – Meeting
Olympia*

*Thursday, March 16, 2006 – Meeting
Olympia*

*Thursday, May 11, 2006 – Meeting
Olympia*

*Wednesday, June 28, 2006 – Dinner
Thursday, June 29, 2006 – Meeting
Tacoma*

*Thursday, August 3, 2006 – Retreat
Friday, August 4, 2006 – Retreat
Leavenworth*

*Wednesday, September 20, 2006 – Dinner
Thursday, September 21, 2006 – Meeting
Spokane*

*Wednesday, November 15, 2006 – Dinner
Thursday, November 16, 2006 – Meeting
Seattle*

Interagency Committee
September 7, 2005
Meeting Notes

Attending: Patti Stoneman Lowe, Department of Social and Health Services, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation; Gary Kamimura, Employment Security Department; Kyra Kester, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction; Jim Crabbe and Israel Mendoza, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges; Liz Smith, Labor and Industries, Apprenticeship; Holly McIntire, Federation of Private Career Schools; and Peggy Rudolph, Bryan Wilson, and Walt Wong, Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board.

There were two items on the agenda: Agency Updates and the September 22, 2005, Board meeting agenda.

Agency Updates

Liz Smith announced that Labor and Industries will be recruiting for a new apprenticeship outreach manager who will assist in the development of new programs, and will represent Labor and Industries on the Interagency Committee. Liz also indicated that her office is helping to work on the Governor's proposal to institute a "Running Start Program for Apprentices."

Gary Kamimura announced that Michael Paris has left the Employment Security Department for a position with the Department of Corrections. No decision has been made regarding Michael's position.

Patti Stoneman Lowe announced that the Division Director, Michael O'Brien, has left the agency for a faculty position in New Mexico. Applications have been received from 35 candidates for the position. Don Kay is Acting Director.

Board Meeting Agenda

High Skills, High Wages: 2006 Development Process: Bryan Wilson presented the draft workplan and asked for feedback. Kyra Kester mentioned the importance of having Workforce Development Council representation on the youth work group. She also stressed the importance of consistency between the recommendations of "Washington Learns" and the related pieces of the Plan, and noted that the workplan's time frames were very ambitious. Israel Mendoza, noting that the workplan did not include revisions to the performance accountability chapter, asked that there be some way for the Board to revisit the policy on WIA Section 503 Incentive Grants. Liz Smith asked that Labor and Industries be included among the agencies consulted during the plan development. Bryan Wilson mentioned that Workforce Board staff would be asking the IC members for suggested names for the work groups.

Private Vocational School Act: Peggy Rudolph presented the draft policy changes. IC members suggested improvements to the paper's organization and clarity on which changes are supported by the Federation of Private Vocational Schools and the Board's Private Vocational School Advisory Committee. Jim Crabbe mentioned that in some new IT fields requiring faculty to have two years of experience in the particular field might be problematic. Kyra Kester suggested that schools should be limited to using ESL assessments recognized by the Department of Education. Kyra also requested information on the administrative efforts and costs that would result from requiring performance evaluations for schools to be licensed. Holly McIntire indicated that the Federation would soon provide their response to the proposed changes.

**WASHINGTON STATE
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
MEETING NO. 105
SEPTEMBER 22, 2005**

SKILL PANELS BUDGET REQUEST

Background:

In 2004, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) submitted a \$2 million budget request to the Governor's office for the 2005-2007 biennium to form 18-20 new industry skill panels. The budget request was planned in partnership with the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) to strengthen the linkages between workforce and economic development in Washington by addressing industries in key clusters that hold competitive advantages. As part of that partnership, the Workforce Board also endorsed SBCTC's request for \$7.05 million to increase the training grants provided by the Job Skills Program to a total of \$10 million for the biennium.

The existing skill panels support key goals in *High Skills, High Wages 2004: Washington's Strategic Plan for Workforce Development*. Forming new alliances of business, education and labor through skill panels and sustaining existing ones remains a top priority of the Board. The attached resolution identifies the rationale for skill panels and approves a budget submittal to the Governor's Office for \$1 million in general fund monies in the 2005-2007 supplemental budget to sustain and expand the alliances.

Board Action Requested: Adoption of the attached resolution in support of a skill panels budget request.

Skill Panels Budget Resolution

WHEREAS, *High Skills, High Wages* Strategy 1.1.1 calls for creating and expanding industry skill panels, especially in high-demand economic clusters;

WHEREAS, Funding skill panels alliances of business, education, and labor will accelerate economic development in more sectors and areas of the state;

WHEREAS, Skill panels can reveal what kinds of jobs and skill needs are emerging in an industry;

WHEREAS, Funding skill panels will move the state closer to closing the Skills Gap (HSHW) of Washington workers in a shorter time period, thus keeping Washington companies strong;

WHEREAS, Funding skill panels will continue to influence curriculum needed by industry;

WHEREAS, Funding skill panels will create a private sector more confident in the responsiveness of the public sector and spur company investments in training;

WHEREAS, Funding skill panels will mean more skilled workers can be hired and promoted to better jobs in Washington companies;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board hereby approves the submittal of a 2005-2007 supplemental budget request in the amount of \$1 million to support new and existing skill panels – alliances of business, education, and labor.

**WASHINGTON STATE
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
MEETING NO. 105
SEPTEMBER 22, 2005**

OPERATING AGENCIES' 2005-2007 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUESTS

Background:

RCW 28C.18.060(5) directs the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board to "... review and make recommendations to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) and the legislature on operating and capital budget requests for operating agencies of the state training system for purposes of consistency with the state comprehensive plan for workforce training and education." The Board has adopted standards for the review process that focus on *High Skills*, *High Wages* priorities and continuous improvement concerns (see attached).

OFM asked agencies to submit their budget decision packages by October 17, 2005. At the September meeting, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Employment Security Department will preview their workforce-related supplemental budget requests and discuss how they relate to the priorities of the Board. At the November meeting, the board will act on endorsing budget requests.

Board Action Requested: None. For discussion only

AGENCY BUDGET REQUESTS FOR THE 2005-2007 BIENNIUM: Principles and Inspection Questions

Principles

- Be consistent with the state strategic plan for workforce development.
- Be responsive to areas of possible improvement identified in *Workforce Training Results*, *Workforce Training: Supply, Demand, and Gaps* and other evaluative efforts that acknowledge customer needs.
- Be informed by continuous quality improvement efforts.
- Reflect long-term thinking, as well as short-term and immediate funding needs.

Continuous Improvement Inspection Questions

- How does the request relate to the agency's strategic plan, activity inventory, and appropriate goals and performance measures?
- How were the views of business and labor customers included in developing the funding request?
- How was the information on program results used to determine funding priorities?
- How will results related to the expenditure be measured?
- How will the expenditures be integrated with current activities and/or coordinated with other agencies work?
- What is the rationale for additional resources beyond current funding level?

Priority for Board Advocacy

The Board will provide the highest level of support during the upcoming legislative session to operating agency budget requests that implement the strategies set forth in the state *High Skills, High Wages: Washington's Strategic Plan for Workforce Development*, provided such requests are endorsed by the Governor.

**WASHINGTON STATE
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
MEETING NO. 105
SEPTEMBER 22, 2005**

PRIVATE CAREER SCHOOL ACT UPDATE

Background:

Last July, staff presented an update on the closures of BCTI and go2cert.com and the effect those closures had on students. The Board discussed ideas for strengthening private career school regulations so staff can easily identify at-risk schools, help schools correct deficiencies that threaten their ability to operate effectively, and support students in the event of a closure.

As a result of the discussion, the Board members identified three areas warranting attention: 1) an early warning and intervention system for schools in trouble; 2) eligibility for licensure based on fiscal responsibility; and 3) student transition services and refunds. Attached is a summary of proposed changes to the PVSA WAC designed to address those areas. The summary also includes recommendations by staff for changes that will clarify or strengthen various other sections of the regulations. The proposed changes are supported by both the Private Vocational School Advisory Committee and the Washington Federation of Private Career Schools and Colleges. The Board could make the changes either by regulation or by requesting a statutory change by the Legislature.

Also attached is a paper to generate further discussion on the issue of performance standards as a licensing requirement. This is an area where the Board did not reach consensus at the July meeting. The paper identifies the current Eligible Training Provider List performance standards upon which private career school standards might be based, a summary of what some other states are doing about private career school performance, and a list of pros and cons associated with the implementation of such standards. If change in this is desired, the Board could also establish performance standards either through regulation or requesting statutory changes.

The third attachment is a proposal to increase assistance available to students affected by a school closure. The assistance would be in the form of a "rapid response" team made up of representatives of agencies that could provide information on transfer options, financial aid forgiveness, work search assistance, and other areas of need.

After this face sheet is a recommended motion with two options; one is to proceed with the plan of action described in the attachments including the addition of performance standards, the other is to proceed with the plan excluding the performance standards.

Board Action Required: Adoption of one of the recommended motion options.

RECOMMENDED MOTION

WHEREAS, The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board is responsible for administering the Private Vocational School Act;

WHEREAS, The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board intends to administer the Act in a way that ensures adequate educational quality at private vocational schools;

WHEREAS, The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board has reviewed the Act and its regulations and conducted discussions regarding the effective administration of the private vocational school statute;

WHEREAS, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board desires to strengthen requirements to ensure that consumers are protected and private career schools meet minimum licensing standards;

WHEREAS, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board wants to ensure that, in the event of a school closure, students receive prompt and effective assistance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board approves the proposed changes including the addition of performance standards and the development of a rapid response team to assist students affected by a school closure.

OR

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board approves the proposed changes, excluding the addition of performance standards. The Board also approves the development of a rapid response team to assist students affected by a school closure.

Summary of Proposed Changes

Changes Designed to Mitigate the Effects of a School Closure

- Define specific standards schools must meet in order to demonstrate financial responsibility, e.g., current assets to current liabilities ratio of at least 1:1; a positive net worth for the school's most recent fiscal year; and no operating losses for the past two years.
- Require accredited schools to submit an audited financial statement with their annual license renewal application (non-accredited schools will continue to submit an un-audited financial statement on a form developed by the agency).
- Designate a school "at-risk" if it fails to meet standards of financial responsibility or generates a number of substantiated student complaints.
- Place at-risk schools on probation and required them to correct deficiencies within a specified time:
 - (a) Schools will be required to provide: (i) a school improvement plan acceptable to the agency; (ii) evidence of a line of credit, if appropriate; and (iii) student identification data on a monthly basis.
 - (b) If the school is not able to correct identified deficiencies in the specified time, the agency will suspend or revoke its license.
 - (c) The agency will post on its website the names of schools that have had their licenses suspended or revoked.

Other Proposed Changes

- Prior to enrolling a student, require schools to administer a Department of Education approved ESL exam to applicants for whom English is a second language.
- Require all instructors to have at least two years of work experience, postsecondary education, or a combination of the two, in the subject they teach. Schools can request a waiver of the two year requirement.

Requiring Private Career Schools to Meet Minimum Performance Standards

The Workforce Board maintains performance standards for programs listed on the state Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL) used for WIA Title I, the Training Benefits Program, and WorkFirst.

1. The current ETPL standards are:
 - (a) 20 percent completion rate
 - (b) 50 percent entered employment rate; and
 - (c) an earnings level of \$3207.50 for the third quarter after graduation.
2. Other states' approaches to performance standards:
 - (a) Arkansas and Missouri require schools whose completion or placement rate falls below 50 percent to provide an explanation and bring the rate up to 50 percent by the next recertification date.
 - (b) Ohio requires schools whose completion or placement rate is one or more standard deviations below the average to provide an explanation for the deviation. The licensing board may take disciplinary action against a school whose explanation is not acceptable.
 - (c) Oregon requires schools to maintain 50 percent completion and placement rates for each program. Schools falling below 50 percent are placed on probation until they bring their rate up to the minimum. Licenses may be revoked if a school fails to reach 50 percent for two consecutive reporting periods.
 - (d) Pennsylvania and North Carolina are both considering adding such standards; they currently require schools to report data but there are no minimum standards or penalties for poor performance.
 - (e) In Minnesota, schools offering placement assistance must place a majority of their graduates in the field of study or a related field.
 - (f) New York requires schools to submit the information but doesn't set minimum standards.
3. Arguments for implementing minimum standards for performance
 - (a) Standards would weed out the poorest performers.
 - (b) Standards would strengthen our consumer protection function by holding schools more accountable for outcomes.
 - (c) Schools are already providing the student data that would be used to determine completion, employment and wage rates; this change would not be an additional administrative burden on the schools.
4. Arguments against implementing minimum standards for performance.
 - (a) Given how modest the ETPL standards are, the benefit might not be sufficient to justify the increased resources needed for implementation.
 - (b) Additional requirements for licensing might not be warranted given that the vast majority of schools are already functioning at an acceptable level.
 - (c) Dropping programs that do not meet performance standards would limit the career choices available to the state's citizens.
 - (d) There are significant difficulties in calculating the performance of small programs and programs that typically lead to self employment (e.g., massage therapist).

Rapid Response Team to Assist Students Affected by a Private Career School Closure

Statement of Problem: The private vocational school act (RCW28C.10) directs the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) to administer a tuition recovery trust fund (TRTF) for the purpose of paying refunds to students affected by school closures. The Board has an effective system in place for meeting that obligation. Following the closures of BCTI and go2cert.com, it became clear that we need to do more to assist students.

When they closed their doors unexpectedly, BCTI and go2cert.com displaced over 500 students. Students came to school on a Monday morning to find the doors locked and a notice taped to the door stating that classes were suspended. Board staff handled over 300 telephone calls from affected students during the first few weeks following those closures.

Students were justifiably angry and confused. They wanted answers to questions about completing their training. They wanted to know which schools had similar programs and would accept credits earned at the closed schools. They wanted to know whether their student loans could be transferred to another school. Some of the calls we received were from students who had recently graduated and were working with their school's job placement office. They wanted to know where they could get help finding a job. We received several calls from students who had been promised state need grants and were waiting for a check so they could pay their rent. Staff did its best to counsel individual students about their options. It was not possible, however, to devote sufficient time to individuals when there were so many students needing attention.

Proposal to Establish a Rapid Response Team to Assist Students Affected by a School Closure:

1. The Workforce Board would re-establish the "safety net" that was facilitated by the Washington Federation of Private Career Schools and Colleges in the early 1990s.
2. The team would operate as a rapid response team that to assemble quickly in response to the abrupt closure of a private career school.
3. In addition to Workforce Board staff, team members would represent other agencies involved with private career school education. The following agencies would be asked to designate an individual or individuals to serve on the team:
 - U.S. Department of Education
 - Washington Federation of Private Career Schools Colleges
 - Local community colleges and universities
 - Higher Education Coordinating Board
 - State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
 - Local WorkSource Centers

4. Workforce Board staff would be responsible for facilitating the operation of the Team including contacting affected students and for annually reviewing the protocols and designated individual(s).

How would the Rapid Response Team work?

Upon learning of a school closure, the Workforce Board would contact team members and obtain agreement on a date to hold an orientation meeting for affected students. The orientation would be scheduled at a location within a reasonable distance of the closed school. Currently proposed WAC revisions to declare a borderline school “at risk” and require it to periodically submit contact information for its students will enhance staff’s ability to reach affected students. Notices of the orientation would also be posted on the Workforce Board’s website, the door of the closed school, and with local media.

The purpose of the orientation would be to provide information to affected students about the services available to assist them in making the transition from their closed school to their next undertaking; e.g., transfer options, financial aid discharge eligibility and procedures, labor market information, job search and placement assistance, and if appropriate, skills assessment, career counseling, and the availability of support services.

How much would it cost to operate the Team?

The Workforce Board would incur nominal costs associated with setting up and facilitating the orientations; staff time, room rental, travel, and materials costs. There would likely be staff time and travel costs incurred by the other team members as well.

The proposed implementation date for implementation of the Rapid Response Team is January 1, 2006.

**WASHINGTON STATE
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
MEETING NO. 105
SEPTEMBER 22, 2005**

**LOCAL AREA WIA TITLE I-B PLANS AND LOCAL AREA STRATEGIC PLANS
FOR THE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM**

Executive Order 99-02 directs Washington State Workforce Development Councils (WDCs), in partnership with Chief Local Elected Officials (CLEO), to develop and maintain two local area plans:

1. An Operations Plan for programs and services funded under Title I-B of the Workforce Investment Act and the Wagner-Peyser Act.
2. A Strategic Plan for the workforce development system.

In the spring of 2000, former Governor Gary Locke, at the recommendation of the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board), approved the 2000-2005 local plans.

In the last eight months, all 12 WDC worked with their CLEOs and community partners to develop new 2005-2007 plans. The WDCs updated their WIA Operations Plans following guidelines issued by the Employment Security Department (ESD). The WDCs updated their local area Strategic Plans following guidelines adopted by the Workforce Board on January 27, 2005.

The Workforce Board is responsible for reviewing the local plans for consistency with “*High Skills, High Wages 2004*” and recommending to Governor Gregoire whether or not the local plans should be approved. On March 31, 2005, the Board adopted its plan review process. The Board delegated the review of the local area strategic plans to Workforce Board staff and delegated the review of local area WIA Operations Plans to ESD staff, with the expectation that staff present their recommendations to the Board on September 22, 2005.

The Workforce Board sets local area WIA Title I-B performance targets based on state targets (previously adopted by the Board and the U.S. Department of Labor). The Board adjusts the targets for local economic conditions and demographics of program participants and negotiates with the twelve local areas to establish the WIA Title I-B performance targets for each local area. The negotiation process to establish targets for years six and seven (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2007) is nearing completion. The Workforce Board will take action to adopt years six and seven targets on November 17, 2005. Once the targets are established, the WDCs will incorporate the targets into their area’s Strategic Plan for Workforce Development.

Board Action Required: Adoption of the Recommended Motion.

RECOMMENDED MOTION

WHEREAS, Executive Order 99-02 directs Workforce Development Councils, in partnership with Chief Local Elected Officials, to develop and maintain two local area plans: 1) an operations plan for programs and services funded under Title I-B of the Workforce Investment Act and Wagner-Peyser Act; and 2) a strategic plan for the workforce development system; and

WHEREAS, Workforce Development Councils have adopted new, 2005-2007 plans to guide WIA Title I-B and Wagner-Peyser grant activities and to establish strategic direction for the local area's workforce development system; and

WHEREAS, Employment Security Department staff completed a review of the twelve local area WIA/Wagner-Peyser operations plans, determined ten plans to be complete, and recommend plan approval of these plans. Staff recommends two plans be conditionally approved.

WHEREAS, Staff of the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board completed a review of the twelve local area strategic plans, determined the plans to be complete, consistent with *High Skills, High Wages 2004: Washington's Strategic Plan for Workforce Development*, and recommend plan approval;

WHEREAS, Executive Order 99-02 directs the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board to:

Review the plans of local workforce development councils for consistency with the state unified plan and recommend to the Governor whether or not local plans should be approved

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board recommends Governor approval of the twelve local area 2005-2007 Strategic Plans and of ten WIA Title I-B and Wagner-Peyser Operations Plans. The Board recommends Governor approval of the Southwest Washington and the Snohomish County Operations Plans once the plans are adopted by the respective Councils and the Chief Local Elected Officials and submitted to ESD for review.

WHEREAS, The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board's negotiation with the twelve Workforce Development Councils to establish WIA Title I-B performance targets for years six and seven (July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2007) is nearing completion; and

WHEREAS, The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board will take action to adopt years six and seven targets on November 17, 2005.

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That once years six and seven targets are established, the Workforce Development Councils will incorporate the targets into their area's 2005-2007 Local Area Strategic Plan for Workforce Development.

2005-2007 Local Area Strategic Plans for the Workforce Development System

Summary of Workforce Board Staff Review

All 12 Workforce Development Councils (WDCs), in consultation with Chief Local Elected Officials (CLEOs), have adopted their area's 2005-2007 Strategic Plan for the Workforce Development System.

All 12 local area strategic plans:

- Articulate a vision for the local area's workforce development system.
- Used a planning process that assured opportunities for business, labor, CLEOs, program operators, WorkSource partner agencies, and others to communicate their needs, offer their perspectives and expertise, and participate in the process.
- Include background chapters that: 1) assess the local area economy, its future course, and the market-driven skills it will demand; 2) analyze local area economic development strategies and how workforce development strategies are linked to economic development strategies; 3) assess the current and future workforce in the local area (demographic characteristics, educational and literacy levels, and planning implications); 4) describe the workforce development system in the local area; and 5) provide information on performance accountability.
- Present goals, objectives, and strategies for the workforce development system.

These local area strategies represent the priorities of the WDC and its partners. The plans describe strategies to increase skill levels, employment, earnings, productivity, customer satisfaction, reduce poverty, and increase the return on workforce development investments in the area. Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board staff determined that all 12 of the local area plans present goals, objectives, and strategies that are aligned and consistent with *High Skills, High Wages 2004: Washington's Strategic Plan for Workforce Development*.

- Include strategies that workforce development system stakeholders plan to implement during the next two years to increase WorkFirst and WorkSource partner program service integration.
- Include a written assurance that negotiated WIA Title I-B performance targets will part of the local area plan. Once WIA Title I-B performance targets are adopted by the Workforce Board, the Workforce Development Councils will incorporate the targets into their area's 2005-2007 Local Area Strategic Plan for Workforce Development.

Workforce Board Staff Recommendation: The 12 plans are useful contemporary guides. Approval of the two-part motion is recommended.

Workforce Investment Act and Wagner Peyser Local Operations Plans

Each of the twelve Workforce Development Councils are required to develop an operations plan for the Workforce Investment Act and Wagner Peyser programs in the area. The purpose of the plans is to describe administrative and service delivery operations provided through the one-stop (WorkSource) system.

The law requires a five-year plan. However, in anticipation of possible changes through WIA reauthorization, only a two year plan was requested.

The plans are reviewed to ensure compliance and to address how administrative, program, and systems operations meet federal and state strategic directions.

The review panel consisted of representatives from the WIA, Wagner Peyser, the Employment Security WorkFirst, and the Workforce Board.

The plans provided descriptions of:

- The structure of the Workforce Development Council and Youth Council.
- The local administrative structure and several local policies.
- Current and future efforts to integrate services to particular customer groups including e.g., youth in need, veterans, dislocated workers, persons with disabilities, and employers.
- Preparations for how common performance measures will be tracked and overseen, based on changes at the federal level.
- Requests for allowable waivers to the law of interest to the Council.

The plans also include a set of assurances, which ensure that other specific requirements of the law are met.

ESD Staff Recommendations: Recommend Governor approval of ten operations plans. Recommend Governor approval of Southwest Washington and Snohomish County Operations Plans once the plans are adopted by the respective Councils and the Chief Local Elected Officials and meet state requirements.

**WASHINGTON STATE
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
MEETING NO. 105
SEPTEMBER 22, 2005**

**DROPOUT PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROJECTS
2004-2005 PRELIMINARY EVALUATION**

In November 2003, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) adopted resolution 03-94-02 accepting an action plan to address the issue of high school graduation in Washington state using WIA statewide activities funds. Staff from the Workforce Board, Employment Security Department (ESD), and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction together determined that the funds support dropout prevention and retrieval projects in the state's 12 Workforce Development Areas during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 program years.

The Workforce Board has the responsibility of conducting an annual evaluation of this statewide initiative based on data provided by the Workforce Development Councils (WDCs) to ESD. This is the evaluation of the first year of the initiative.

Major findings of this evaluation are the following:

- The collaborative partnerships established between WDC, schools and districts, and their communities were essential to project successes.
- Projects were better able to serve their dropouts and at-risk students because of the flexibility they were given in how they structured their services and activities.
- The issue of WIA income-eligibility should be re-visited for the second year of the initiative.
- The availability and quality of the quantitative data collected must be improved in order to validly evaluate the outcomes of the initiative.

Board Action Required: None. For informational purposes only.

Dropout Prevention and Intervention Projects 2004-2005 Evaluation

Background

In November 2003, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) adopted resolution 03-94-02 accepting an action plan to address the issue of high school graduation in Washington State. The resolution included direction to staff to work with partner agencies, including Employment Security Department (ESD) and Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), on utilizing Workforce Investment Act (WIA) statewide activities funds to implement a dropout prevention and retrieval initiative. The partners determined that statewide activities funds (\$1.34 million) for program years 2003 and 2004 would support dropout prevention and retrieval projects in the 12 workforce development areas. After a base amount of \$100,000, the remaining funds would be allocated using ESD's WIA youth formula for funds distribution.

In June 2004, ESD issued the "Application for Funds" for the WIA Statewide Dropout Prevention and Intervention Program (DPI) (1) to serve concentrations of eligible youth and (2) to address the high school dropout problem. The goals of DPI are the following:¹

- Focus 10 percent statewide funds toward youth who are low-income and who have dropped out of school or who are at-risk of dropping out of school.
- Use 10 percent funds to leverage Basic Education Act (BEA) money for this initiative and, thus, to multiply the effects of limited resources.
- Increase the on-time graduation rate for the enrolled participants of the program.
- Demonstrate the effectiveness of this model for large scale initiatives in the future.

The local projects were to start as soon as possible in the 2004-2005 program year with an end date of March 31, 2006. Workforce Development Councils (WDCs) were to work with school boards, their constituencies and communities, and others in local control of the school system to design, develop, implement, and evaluate their project. The primary activity of local projects is helping students finish school and receive their high school diploma. However, in the first year of initiative, local projects were allowed to spend some of their funds for development efforts.

With regard to accountability, WDCs are responsible for monitoring the progress of their project and submitting quarterly reports to ESD contract managers. The quarterly reports include two sections: (1) the Narrative report, in which WDCs are asked to include information concerning the progress of the project and issues that have arisen, including assistance needed, and (2) the Participant and Quarterly Expenditure report, which WDCs use to report data on planned and actual client activity, as well as planned and actual expenditures.

In addition to the quarterly reports, WDCs are required to document the enrollment of DPI project participants in the WIA information management system, Service, Knowledge, and Information Exchange System (SKIES). The data in SKIES would provide the following information on each participant:²

¹ The goals are taken verbatim from the Application for Funds, page 2.

² Source: PowerPoint presentation titled "WIA 10 percent Youth Statewide Dropout Prevention and Intervention: Data Entry Procedures for Participant Activities & Outcomes"

- Training program & services received
- Training program duration, state and end dates
 - Start date(s) of training
 - End date(s) of training
- Enrollment status (pre, during, post)
- Intervention Outcomes:
 - Primary
 - Dropouts retrieved (i.e., Returned to School)
 - At Risk retained
 - Diplomas earned
 - On-target to receive diploma on-time
 - Secondary
 - Skill goals obtained or GED
 - Credentials

This preliminary evaluation covers the first year, 2004-2005, of the DPI initiative. The findings are based on the WDC quarterly reports submitted to ESD and a compilation of WDC level quantitative data prepared by ESD staff. Several project proposals were negotiated late into 2004, and one proposal into 2005. As detailed below, many school/school district partners required SKIES training, and still needed to establish separate databases in order to track non-WIA participants. This has taken a great deal of time, and results showing trends, successes or challenges over time are now just beginning to emerge.

Data Sources

SKIES. School/school district staff have been or are being trained to input participant data into SKIES. Currently SKIES is intended to capture, among other demographic and programmatic information, all DPI project outcome data with the exception of credits earned; type of school to which dropouts were retrieved—comprehensive, alternative, community college program; number of credits earned; and any data on non-WIA eligible participants. Further, the information on “On-track to graduation On-time” is currently recorded in a Comment field.

These are key elements needed in order to measure the initiative fully. School districts are tracking non-WIA students in separate databases. For many projects, the same person who inputs data into SKIES and a local database is also the person providing or coordinating direct services for students, and this extra challenge has been time consuming. Regardless of intent, many WDCs in their quarterly reports indicated that their data in SKIES are incomplete; that, in fact, they were serving more participants than they had registered in SKIES. However, all such WDCs made assurances to improve their data entry into SKIES.

Quarterly Reports. In terms of quantitative data, an initial review of the WDC quarterly reports submitted as of August 10, 2005, showed variability among the WDCs in how much and how well they have reported on participant information.

Consequently, neither SKIES nor the quarterly reports had comprehensive data for all WDCs on enrollments and outcomes. A review by ESD staff showed that the SKIES data were less complete than the quarterly reports. ESD staff proceeded to collect performance data aggregated at the WDC level for all WDCs. It is this compilation of aggregated data that is the source of the quantitative analysis for this evaluation. These data are for WIA-eligible participants only. ESD staff also collected data on non-WIA-eligible participants served directly from the WDCs.

Survey of WDCs. In the of summer 2005, ESD conducted a survey of the WDCs regarding several aspects of the DPI initiative. A summary of the responses to the survey provided by ESD was an additional source of information for this evaluation.

Findings

WDCs were generally sanguine regarding the implementation and outcomes of their DPI project's first year activities. The large majority was able to implement all or most of their projects as planned. Not unexpectedly, there were, and continue to be, hurdles to overcome. However, despite difficulties, all WDCs reported having a successful year. Some of the positive outcomes that are not being systematically tracked by the DPI initiative but that have been observed by WDCs include improved school attendance, improved grades, improved reading skills, and more positive attitudes about school.

Some of the WDCs indicated that it was too early to identify best practices; others were able to identify promising practices that they felt led to beneficial results.

Program Implementation

As indicated in Table 1, WDCs planned to serve 1,035 participants, utilizing \$1,354,200 WIA 10 percent funds and leveraging \$2,196,250 BEA funds throughout the two years of the DPI initiative. The number of planned participants dropped from 1,267 participants statewide, as calculated from the initial 12 proposals. The amount of planned BEA funds varied by WDC. Typically, the higher the student population in the districts covered by the WDC, the higher the level of BEA funds expected. Because the amount of WIA funds was basically the same for all WDCs, the number of participants WDCs planned to served appeared to be largely a function of the amount of BEA funds they expected to leverage.

At the end of this first year, some of the WDCs reported that for various reasons some of their partner districts and schools withdrew from the project. Hence, the number served would not be as large as planned and the BEA dollar commitment would not be as large as anticipated. Most WDCs reported the importance and value of the partnerships in this endeavor. The typical partnership consisted of the WDC, school districts and schools, other school entities such as the Education Service Districts, and the larger community, including business.

Table 1. Start Dates and Planned Number of Participants and Funding by WDC

WDC	Start Date	Planned # of Participants	WIA Funds	BEA Funds
Olympic	November 1, 2004	100	\$105,342	\$40,000
Pacific Mountain	February 15, 2005	74	\$108,642	\$140,321
Northwest WA	November 15, 2004	50	\$108,131	\$55,389
Snohomish County	January 3, 2005	50	\$113,787	\$365,200
Seattle-King County	October 1, 2004	45	\$135,796	\$351,655
Tacoma-Pierce County	December 15, 2004	466	\$116,564	\$232,000
Southwest WA	October 1, 2004	45	\$113,486	\$135,000
North Central WA	August 23, 2004	30	\$116,654	\$232,000
Tri-County	September 15, 2004	30	\$110,494	\$64,114
Eastern WA Partnership	September 15, 2004	30	\$110,494	\$64,000
Benton-Franklin	December 1, 2004	15	\$104,733	\$18,000
Spokane Area	October 11, 2004	100	\$110,077	\$498,571
Statewide		1,035	\$1,354,200	\$2,196,250

Source: ESD Summary report of WDC fourth quarterly report provided 8/15/05.

With regard to the incompleteness of the SKIES data, in the ESD survey, WDCs indicated that the data entry into SKIES required a workload that seemed disproportionate to the monetary payoff. WDCs felt that state level planners had unrealistic expectations of the projects to track outcomes, deliverables, and especially on-time graduation requirements.

Program Designs

Staff from the Workforce Board, ESD, and OSPI determined initially that they needed to allow WDCs considerable flexibility in designing their local project. Their rationale was that local areas know best their students' needs and what resources are available in their communities for a project that sought to assist dropout and students at-risk of dropping out obtain their high school diplomas.

WDCs and their partners took this opportunity to heart. The result was a statewide initiative that manifested itself somewhat differently from WDC to WDC. What was universal was that all projects involve multiple districts or schools and all projects focused in some way on credit retrieval. All local projects provided school year activities and some also provided summer programs that were more than the traditional academic summer school.

With regard to project services, projects extended the impact of WIA 10 percent funds by leveraging BEA dollars and WIA I-B youth funds for DPI participants who were also WIA eligible. One of the WDCs noted that the WIA I-B youth funds provided support services sorely needed by the targeted population but not possible to provide with the DPI funds alone. The added social support services increased the likelihood of successful outcomes of the academic services.

Issues

Invariably, initiatives such as DPI encounter implementation hurdles and issues. This is particularly true of the first year of operation but would not be unexpected in subsequent years. In their quarterly reports, WDCs noted several issues ranging from school policies that encumber operations to students' lack of motivation and understanding of the importance of obtaining a high school diploma.

Many WDCs reported that the income-eligibility requirement for WIA participants was a barrier to enrollments. Some parents were unwilling to provide this information. Some dropouts who were working had incomes that were above the WIA low-income requirement.

Some of the WDCs indicated that they were able to more easily serve students at-risk of dropping out than dropouts. The dropout population tends to be highly mobile and, consequently, difficult to track down. Parents of dropouts are not often willing to provide updated information on their children. As one might expect, dropouts tend to be unmotivated and DPI staff have had difficulty in convincing many of the value of a high school diploma. Additionally, this is a population that has multiple barriers and often the academic problems are the least difficult to resolve.

Some of the district and school partners withdrew from the project just before implementation. Further, in some cases, the expected level of BEA funding was not available to the DPI project. These factors resulted in fewer resources to serve students and, as a result, either fewer students were served or fewer services were available. Either result could negatively impact performance measures. One of the WDCs indicated that a couple of their district partners were considering not participating in the second year of the program.

Some of the projects encountered staffing problems that slowed implementation progress. When original staff left, it took time to bring the new staff up to speed on all aspects of the project; this tended to delay service provision.

A few of the projects came up against district and school policies that proved challenging and tended to have negative impacts on implementation and participant enrollments. For example, one of the school districts requires staff to be fingerprinted before working with students. The finger printing process takes 6-8 weeks. When new staff was hired mid-year, the waiting time slowed the provision of services to participants. Working with multiple districts or schools sometimes meant working with multiple school schedules; dealing with different spring breaks, for example, proved challenging in scheduling activities for the participants. Some of the school districts prohibited the DPI project to work with students during WASL testing. One of the districts required dropouts to interview with the principal before being allowed to enroll back in school; this proved to be a deterrent to some dropouts.

Finally, some of the projects encountered resistance from teachers and staff who were not a part of the DPI project. The resistance was in terms of approving credits earned through self-paced on-line courses such as NOVA Net towards graduation requirements.

Promising Practices

Having experienced a successful first year, WDCs shared their promising practices or lessons learned. WDCs pointed out the importance of good relationships. Several WDCs indicated that collaborative relationships established between WDC and school district staff or among consortium partners were essential to the success of their programs. The willingness among partners to share information and work responsibilities contributed to project success. Trusting relationships between DPI staff and participants were important because students responded well to staff who they felt cared about and advocated for them. One of the WDCs reported that their relationship with parents was vital to student academic success. Interestingly, one of their school districts involves parents as a group, while the other involves parents on a one-on-one basis and both formats are proving successful.

WDCs also found the flexibility allowed in structuring their projects allowed them to be more responsive to the needs of their participants leading to more positive outcomes. The status quo was not working well, if at all, for these students and, therefore, to be successful, it was necessary to be able to think and act “outside the box. For example one of the WDCs indicated that their model of focusing on reading strategies linked to occupation learning and exploration proved to be highly successful.

A WDC experienced what could be described as an unexpected benefit. Its enrollments fell short of the planned number but the outcomes exceeded expectations leading to the possible conclusion: working with fewer students results in better outcomes.

Finally, one of the WDCs explained that sometimes an aspect of the program can be its greatest strength and its greatest weakness. Being co-located on the high school campus allowed DPI staff to directly schedule students into classes, provided DPI staff with ready access to student records, and allowed DPI staff to create a strong partnership with the school counselors. All of these factors leading to more positive outcomes. On the other hand, unfortunately, students treated their DPI class as “just another class” and not their last chance to complete high school in time.

Program Enrollment and Outcomes

The data presented here should be interpreted with some caution. At the end of this first year, some of the projects were not as current on their data entry as they should have been and some of the WDCs interpreted the outcome measures differently from other WDCs.³ These data quality issues need to be worked out during the coming year.

As shown in Table 2, during the 2004-2005 program year, the DPI initiative served approximately 338 WIA eligible participants; of these 120 were dropouts and 218 were students at-risk of dropping out. Of the dropouts, 70 were retrieved back to school. Of the at-risk students, 167 were retained.

³ For example, a couple of the WDCs appeared to have considered the Dropouts Enrolled and Dropouts Retrieved as mutually exclusive groups, while others appear to have considered Dropouts Retrieved as subset of Dropouts Enrolled. Some of the WDCs reported no Credits Earned; while this is possible, it is unexpected. Some of the WDCs were not able to determine whether or not their participants were on-track to graduate on-time and therefore reported none for that outcome (see Appendix B for data by WDC).

In total, participants earned 539 credits. This averaged to about 1.6 credits per enrollee. Fifty-six of the students earned a high school diploma during the year and one hundred and four were on-track to graduate from high school on-time.⁴

One of the goals of the DPI initiative was to leverage BEA funds. Use of BEA funds allowed projects to serve targeted youth who were otherwise non-WIA eligible. The local projects served 833 non-WIA eligible participants; 168 of them received their high school diploma.

Table 2. Statewide Program Outcome Measures: Program Year 2004-2005

WIA-Eligible Participants	#
Number Dropouts Enrolled	120
Number At-risk Enrolled	218
Number of Dropouts Retrieved	70
Number of At-risk Retained	167
Number of Credits Earned	539
Number of Diplomas Earned	56
Number On-Track to Receive Diploma On-Time	104
<hr/>	
Non-WIA-Eligible Participants	#
Number of Non-WIA Eligible Participants Served	833
Number of Non-WIA Eligible Participants who Received High School Diploma	168

Source: WIA-eligible participant data provided by ESD on 9/6/05. Non-WIA eligible participant data provided by ESD on 8/10/05.

⁴ The Number On-Track to Receive a Diploma On-Time appears to include some of those who received Diplomas; although, it is not clear that it includes all those who received their diploma on-time.

**WASHINGTON STATE
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
MEETING NO. 105
SEPTEMBER 22, 2005**

HIGH SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING

Background

The 2005 Legislature passed SHCR 4408 that creates a Joint Select Committee (membership attached) to examine the basic structure of middle and high schools. The committee is to look at models for middle and high school organization that successfully reduce dropout rates, accelerate achievement, and provide more flexible options for students who are juniors and seniors, among other issues. The committee will produce a report to the full Legislature in January, 2006. In conjunction with this legislative focus, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction is assigned to research best practices for high school restructuring in the context of a standards-based, individual student-focused vision of secondary schools.

In addition to a state examination of high school, Congress is in the midst of reauthorizing the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 (Perkins Act). Both House and Senate reauthorization bills continue support for the role of career and technical education in high school, but provide some new directions.

Attached is a resolution for Board approval adopting a policy position on high school restructuring. Also attached is the policy paper for Board advocacy on career-related issues. This paper was presented to the Board for discussion purposes at the July Board meeting.

Board Action Requested: Adoption of the proposed resolution on High School Restructuring.

Draft High School Restructuring Resolution

WHEREAS, Students in middle and high school need adult guidance to help select courses that match their interests and skills, to increase their chances of staying in school and graduating, and to improve their transition to post-high school education and training;

WHEREAS, There is no specific state policy on career guidance;

WHEREAS, High Skills, High Wages strategy 1.2.1 calls for the development of individual career plans "...to ensure all youth are aware of the link between learning and employment and their career options, including high-wage, high demand occupations, and nontraditional occupations;"

WHEREAS, More students need a foundation of employability skills and occupational skills to progress successfully in their chosen career;

WHEREAS, The Board is concerned that the importance of developing proficiency in work-related skills is not always well understood in local schools;

WHEREAS, High Skills, High Wages Strategy 1.3.5 calls for enhancing "employability skills" training in workforce development programs;

WHEREAS, High Skills, High Wages Strategy 3.1.1 states "Ensure all youth achieve the necessary core skills as established by industries in their chosen career pathways...;"

WHEREAS, Secondary schools should provide program options that enable students to pursue efficiently postsecondary academic and technical credentialing relevant to their chosen careers;

WHEREAS, High Skills, High Wages Strategy 1.1.3 states "Develop competency-based education and training programs and modular curricula and assessments that are linked to industry skill standards;"

WHEREAS, High Skills, High Wages Strategy 1.3.1 states "Develop new programs and increase student enrollments in workforce training, especially in high-demand industry clusters such as health care and IT;"

WHEREAS, High Skills, High Wages Strategy 1.2.3 states "Increase mentor and work-based learning opportunities for all students, and integrate those opportunities with individual career plans;" and

WHEREAS, High Skills, High Wages Strategy 1.3.3 states "Improve efficiency of student transitions by granting credit for prior learning, developing further statewide agreements for...articulation..."

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOVED THAT secondary school reform in the state of Washington should address the following components to ensure adequate career-related planning and education:

1. Implement a comprehensive guidance curriculum, such as Navigation 101, in all middle school and high schools.
2. Require all high schools to provide instruction in employability skills and occupationally specific skills. Standards for such skills should be clear and methods of assessment appropriate to secondary schools should be used.
3. Provide rigorous academic and career-centered programs of study that enable students to pursue their individual high school and beyond plans efficiently. Such programs of study should provide:
 - a. the knowledge and skills needed by students to qualify for placement in the postsecondary education or training program that awards the credential or degree most clearly related to the student's individual career goal.
 - b. applied learning opportunities, such as project-based learning, mentoring, work-based learning, and exploratory and preparatory career and technical education courses.
 - c. articulated pathways to postsecondary education and training that include the opportunity to earn college credit and/or relevant portions of industry certifications.
4. Adopt a performance measure for the successful transition of high school graduates to postsecondary education and training as a part of the K-12 accountability system.

Joint Select Committee on Secondary Education

Senator Dave Schmidt, 44th District, Everett

Senator Rosemary McAuliffe, 1st District, Bothell

Senator Tracey Eide, 30th District, Federal Way

Representative Dave Quall, 40th District, Mount Vernon

Representative Pat Sullivan, 47th District, Covington

Representative. Rodney Tom, 48th District, Medina

Representative Jan Shabro, 31st District, Sumner

Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board)
High School Restructuring Draft Policy Objectives
July 7, 2005

The Workforce Board has consistently been an advocate for preparing secondary students with the skills and knowledge needed to be competitive in today's economy. The following career-related policies could be explicit elements of a statewide vision of high school as the restructuring debate unfolds. They could also serve to inform Board discussions as the new Perkins Act is implemented in this state. They are presented here as a draft for purposes of Board discussion.

1. **Expansion of Intensive Career Guidance:** Implement a comprehensive guidance curricula in all middle school and high schools focused on individual student career interests.

Why: To influence student course-taking behaviors, increase retention and graduation, and improve transitions to post-graduate opportunities.

State policy: There is no specific state policy on career guidance. However, WAC 180-51-061 does require students to have a high school and beyond plan for their high school experience, including what they expect to do the year following graduation. The same WAC also requires students to take an "occupational education" credit for high school graduation which is defined to include a requirement for students to "demonstrate knowledge of career options within the related pathway."

Also, WAC 180-56-245 requires secondary schools in the state to provide "a minimum of one full-time person...for counseling and guidance services." The Workforce Board is currently supporting replication in this state of the "Navigation" model for a comprehensive guidance system under the America's Career Resource Network (ACRN) grant (see below).

Federal Policy: The Perkins Act permits local recipients of funds to use funds "to provide career guidance and counseling for students participating in vocational and technical education programs."

The U.S. Department of Education also funds ACRN which is designed to provide information, resources and training on career and education exploration. The Workforce Board administers the program in this state.

Related High Skills, High Wages (HSHW) strategy:

Strategy 1.2.1: Develop individual career plans...to ensure all youth are aware of the link between learning and employment and their career options, including high-wage, high demand occupations, and nontraditional occupations.

2. **Development and Assessment of Career-Related Skills:** Require all high schools to teach employability skills and occupational specific skills. Skill standards for such skills should be identified and assessment tools for measuring the attainment of the skills should be developed.

Why: To enable all students to attain a foundation of employability skills and occupational skills needed to successfully progress in their chosen career.

Current policy: WAC 180-51-061 requires students to take one “occupational education” credit for high school graduation. Occupational education is defined as “a series of learning experiences [that]...align with the definition of an exploratory [CTE] course...” established by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). OSPI has adopted program standards for exploratory and preparatory courses. Under these standards, students are required to (1) demonstrate leadership skills and employability skills and (2) demonstrate foundational and occupational specific skills required to meet current industry defined standards.

There is concern that this policy to teach work-related skills is not well known in local school districts and is over-shadowed by the focus on the Washington Assessment of Student Learning.

Federal Policy: The Perkins Act requires local recipients of funds to “strengthen the academic, and vocational and technical, skills of students participating in vocational and technical education programs....”

Related HSHW strategies:

Strategy 1.3.5: Enhance “employability skills” training in workforce development programs.

Strategy 3.1.1: Ensure all youth achieve the necessary core skills as established by industries in their chosen career pathways...

Strategy 1.2.3: Increase mentor and work-based learning opportunities for all students, and integrate those opportunities with individual career plans.

3. **Improvement of Student Transitions to Non-Baccalaureate Postsecondary Education and Training:**

Provide programs of study that prepare students to efficiently pursue their individual high school and beyond plans. Such programs should provide students with the knowledge and skills needed to qualify for placement in a non-baccalaureate postsecondary education and training program that awards a credential or degree related to their individual career goal.

Career Pathways: Schools should provide applied learning opportunities, such as mentoring, work-based learning and exploratory and preparatory career and technical education courses, in fields of study or pathways articulated with postsecondary education and training.

Accountability: The K-12 accountability system should include a performance measure for the successful transition of high school graduates to postsecondary education and training.

Why: To enable students to efficiently pursue postsecondary academic and technical credentialing through learning options relevant to their chosen careers.

State Policy: RCW 28A.230.010 provides that “school district boards of directors shall identify and offer courses with content that meet or exceed...the courses required to meet the minimum college entrance requirements...and...course options for career development. Such courses may be applied or theoretical, academic, or vocational.”

With respect to program options for career development, RCW 28A.230.130 provides that “all public high schools of the state shall provide a program, directly or in cooperation with a

community or technical college, a skills center, an apprenticeship committee, or another school district, for students who plan to pursue career or work opportunities other than entrance to a baccalaureate-granting institution after being granted a high school diploma. Such programs may include career and technical [CTE] courses, including preparatory course that must ensure that students “be employment ready and/or be prepared for postsecondary options.”

With respect to the K-12 accountability system, OSPI is currently reviewing accountability for CTE programs. Also, ESSB 5732, passed by the 2005 Legislature, requires the new State Board of Education to adopt performance improvement goals in secondary career and technical education programs consistent with the Perkins Act.

Federal Policy: The Perkins Act requires local recipients of funds to (1) strengthen the “...academic, and vocational and technical, components of [vocational and technical] programs...through the integration of academics with vocational and technical education programs through a sequence of courses to ensure learning...” and (2) “link secondary vocational and technical education and postsecondary vocational and technical education, including implementing Tech Prep programs.”

Perkins reauthorization bills pending in Congress require local recipients to link secondary and postsecondary CTE, including offering “model sequence of courses” or “career pathways” and/or implementing Tech Prep programs.

Related HSHW Strategies:

Strategy 1.1.3: Develop competency-based education and training programs and modular curricula and assessments that are linked to industry skill standards.

Strategy 3.1.1: Ensure all youth achieve the necessary core skills as established by industries in their chosen career pathways...

Strategy 1.3.1: Develop new programs and increase student enrollments in workforce training, especially in high-demand industry clusters such as health care and IT.

Strategy 1.2.3: Increase mentor and work-based learning opportunities for all students, and integrate those opportunities with individual career plans.

Strategy 1.3.3: Improve efficiency of student transitions by granting credit for prior learning, developing further statewide agreements for...articulation...

**WASHINGTON STATE
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
MEETING NO. 105
SEPTEMBER 22, 2005**

**HIGH SKILLS, HIGH WAGES: WORK PLAN
SEPTEMBER 2005**

State statutes require the Workforce Board to update the state strategic plan, *High Skills, High Wages*, every two years. The Board last updated the plan in 2004. The Legislature approved the plan last legislative session. This paper outlines a proposed workplan for producing the 2006 update.

High Skill, High Wages consists of five chapters that cover the economy; labor force demographics; the workforce development system; performance accountability; and goals, objectives and strategies for action. Staff recommends that the Board update the entire plan for 2006. While WIA may be reauthorized during 2006, most aspects of *High Skills, High Wages* are at a sufficiently high level that most of the plan should not be affected by reauthorization.

The Interagency Committee provided input on this workplan.

Board Action Requested: Approve the work plan to update *High Skills, High Wages*.

High Skills, High Wages: Work Plan

Steps to Create <i>High Skills, High Wages: 2006</i>	Date
Gather national and state research on workforce development policy	March 2005 onwards
Gather feedback from Workforce Board staff on suggestions for how to change the plan in terms of content, form, and process	August to September 2005
Develop work group lists	
Update IC committee and ask for input	September 2005
Workforce Board approves plan for creating HSHW 06	
Organize meeting dates for work groups	
Elicit guidance from Workforce Conference participants on major issues for new plan	October 2005
Meet separately with representatives from each agency and local areas representatives to work on specific objectives, and gain commitments for strategies and references to HSHW in agency's plans as appropriate	
Draft chapter on demographics	November 2005
Conduct first work group meetings – present papers, begin collaboration: Youth, Skills Gap, Low-Income and Target Populations, PMCI (speakers, presentations, briefing papers and research, facilitation)	
Meet with IC/Update Board (electronically)	
Conduct second round of work groups (speakers, presentations, facilitation)	December 2006
Meet with IC/Update Board (electronically)	
Draft chapter on the economy	January 2006
Write draft sections of Accountability Chapter and Action Plan for dissemination to work groups	January to February 2006
Board approves first draft of Accountability Chapter and Action Plan for broad electronic public review	March 16, 2006
Meet with IC/Update Board (electronically)	April 2006
Conduct third round of work group meetings	
Draft System Chapter	
Write second draft of Accountability Chapter and Action Plan	
Board approves second draft for public review	May 11, 2006
Conduct series of public forums for final input on the plan	May to June 2006
Board Reviews Final Public Input and Considers Changes	June 29, 2006
Board Adopts HSHW 2006	August 3, 2006